



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 6, 2016

Mr. Fernando C. Gomez, J.D., Ph.D.
Vice Chancellor and General Counsel
The Texas State University System
208 East 10th Street, Suite 600
Austin, Texas 78701-2407

OR2016-00375

Dear Mr. Gomez:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 593070.

The Texas State University System (the "system") received a request for ten categories of information related to a specified construction project.¹ You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code.² Additionally, you state release of some of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of several third parties.³ Accordingly, you state you

¹We note we asked the system to provide additional information pursuant to section 552.303 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.303(c)-(d) (if attorney general determines that information in addition to that required by section 552.301 is necessary to render decision, written notice of that fact shall be given to governmental body and requestor, and governmental body shall submit necessary additional information to attorney general not later than seventh calendar day after date of receipt of notice). We have received and considered the correspondence sent by the system pursuant to that request.

²Although you mark information pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code, you have not submitted arguments in support of that exception; therefore, we assume you have withdrawn it. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

³The notified third parties are: Allco, Austin Commercial, Balfour Beatty Construction, LLC, JE Dunn Construction Company, Jordan Foster Construction, LLC, J.T. Vaughn Construction, LLC, KBR Building Group, LLC, Kiewit Building Group Inc., Kitchell Contractors, Inc., Linbeck Group, LLC, SpawGlass

notified the third parties of the request for information and of their rights to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information, portions of which consist of representative samples.⁴

Initially, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from any third party explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any third party has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the system may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest any third party may have in it.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov't Code § 552.107(1). When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than

Construction Corp., SpawGlass Contractors, Inc., and The Whiting-Turner Contracting Company.

⁴We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You state the information you have marked consists of communications between attorneys, employees, and contractors for the system that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the system. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information you have marked consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, the system may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁵

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2* (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref’d n.r.e.); *Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2* (1990).

In *Open Records Decision No. 615*, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v.*

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

Gilbreath, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body's policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body's policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); *see* ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third party, including a consultant or other party, with which the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. We note a governmental body does not share a privity of interest with a third party when the governmental body and the third party are involved in contract negotiations, as the parties interests are adverse.

You state some of the remaining information consists of communications between system employees, officials, and contractors who share a privity of interest with the system. You state this information consists of analyses and recommendations related to the specified project. Upon review, we find the system may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, we find the system has failed to demonstrate it shares a privity of interest or common deliberative process with some of the individuals in the remaining communications. Further, some of the remaining information at issue consists of either general administrative information that does not relate to policymaking or information that is purely factual in nature. Thus, we find the system has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is excepted under section 552.111. Accordingly, the system may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c).⁶ Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Accordingly, the system must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its disclosure.

In summary, the system may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code and the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The system must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its disclosure. The system must release the remaining information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/bhf

⁶The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Ref: ID# 593070

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Joe Ping
Division Manager
Allco
P.O. Box 11807
College Station, Texas 77842
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ron Garrett
Houston Division Manager
Austin Commercial
3000 Wilcrest Drive, Suite 240
Houston, Texas 77042
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Steve Mechler
President, Houston Division
Balfour Beatty Construction, LLC
Suite 200
4321 Directors Row
Houston, Texas 77092
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jay F. Nelson
Executive Vice President
Jordan Foster Construction, LLC
Suite 320
9801 Westheimer
Houston, Texas 77042
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. J. Thomas Vaughn
CEO
J.T. Vaughn Construction, LLC
10355 Westpark Drive
Houston, Texas 77042
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Adam Delk
Vice President
JE Dunn Construction Company
Suite 900
10350 Richmond Avenue
Houston, Texas 77042
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jason Beiter
Senior Vice President
Kiewit Building Group Inc.
Building 3, Suite 125
901 South Mopac Expressway
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bill Cornelius
Project Director
Kitchell Contractors, Inc.
Plaza 1, Suite 500
9442 Capital of Texas Highway North
Austin, Texas 78759
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael P. Browning
Regional Manager
The Whiting-Turner Contracting
Company
Suite 105
13105 Northwest Freeway
Houston, Texas 77040
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Matt Daniel, LEED AP
KBR Building Group, LLC
601 Jefferson Street
Houston, Texas 77002
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Barnes
General Manager
Linbeck Group, LLC
3900 Essex Lane, Suite 1200
Houston, Texas 77027
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Roger Berry
President
SpawGlass Construction Corp.
1300 West Road
Houston, Texas 77041
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Scott Hobza
President, Austin Region
SpawGlass Contractors Inc.
111 Smith Road
Austin, Texas 78721
(w/o enclosures)